

PRIVATE MEMBER'S BILL

mysore ministers' salaries and allowances

(amendment) bill, 1967.

Motion to consider--(Debate continued.)

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I refer to rule 28, 'Allotment of time for private members' business'. This is an imperative rule given under Chapter VI. That rule says:

“The Speaker, after considering the state of business of the Assembly, may allot so many days as may in his opinion be possible, compatibly with the public interest for Private Members business and may allot different days for the disposal of different classes of such business; and on days so allotted for any particular class of business, business of that class shall have precedence. On other days no business other than Government business shall be transacted except with the consent of the Leader of the House.”

Then there is a proviso to that rule. This rule and the proviso to it are very imperative. We have been sitting now for nearly 40 days and we are entitled as a matter of right to at least 5 days or an absolute minimum of 4 days for non-official business. Now even if we consider the Bill that was passed in the morning as non-official business because it refers to the salaries of Members, by no stretch of imagination can it be said that the Bill now given notice of by the Hon'ble Member, Sri Siddaiah Kashimath so far as Ministers's salaries is concerned, is a non-official business, because if it is non-official business then these Ministers must be treated as non-officials. If it is non-official business, these Ministers and their salaries will have to be governed not by a different Act but by the same Act which we just now passed this morning. Therefore my objection to this is this, that we are entitled as a matter of right to at least 4 days. You have got non-official business on hand. It is not as though there is no non-official business available for transaction. When such is the position, in the first place Sri Siddaiah Kashimath has no *locus standi* to bring this Bill. He is not a hireling of the Ministers.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Do not use that word. I object to the word “hireling”.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I must use and I am prepared to take any punishment that comes for it because the Hon'ble Member has no business to sponsor this Bill on behalf of the Ministers.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. To call another Member a ‘hireling’ is something highly objectionable.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—What I said is that he is not the hireling of the Ministers. I did not say that he is the hireling of the Ministers.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hireling is not a word to be used by any Member. The word "hireling" used with reference to any Member is an insinuation against him.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I will press it further. Now the point is, so far as the Hon'ble Member is concerned, he is not a Minister, he is not even a Member of the Treasury Benches. He has no right to sit here and if he were to move this Bill and say that this Bill is sponsored on behalf of the Opposition Party Members. That apart, I humbly submit that this Ministers, Salary Bill is not a non-official business and on a non-official day official business cannot be transacted. We are, as a matter of right, entitled to 4 days. We have now hardly 2½ hours more and so we request you to take up non-official business and not this business.

† శ్రీ ఎం. అర్. తామణి.—న్నామి, బాటిక నీరిన బగ్గె తందిరువ నిర్ణయవన్ను ఈగ తగెదుకోల్చిబేకు. అదన్ను ఈగ తగెదుకోల్చివాడు అగ్యుధాగిదే. వాటా బోడిఫిస నవరు బెంగళారిన నాగరికరిగె బవళ తొందరే కొదుత్తుద్దారే. ఈ కర్మాద్యమ మంత్రిగళ నంబిట జాతి మాదుప లిచారివన్ను వేదలు తగెదుకోల్చితేందు హేల్మాత్తుద్దిరి. బాటిక నీరిన బగ్గె ఒందు నిర్ణయందరే అదక్కు తావు అవకాశకొదుత్తుల్ల. ఇదు యావ న్నాయి? ఈ దిన బాసగ్గి కాయుకలొపగళన్ను తగెదుకోల్చిబేసేందు కాయుకుమాద పట్టయల్లదే. నమగె బెంగళారిన నామాన్య జనతెగ నంబిటపట్ట విషయవన్ను హేలువెదక్కే అవకాశవన్ను తావు కేందుత్తుల్ల. అదే మంత్రిగళ నంబిట జాతి మాదువ లిచారికే వేదలు అధ్యక్షుడువుదిందరే అధ్యవ్సేను?

3-30 P.M.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—Sir, if you permit I wish to say that the point of order raised by Sri H. Siddaveerappa is not supported either by rules or any provisions of the constitutional law. The position is we are working on days allotted for non-official work. The question is what is non-official work. The interpretation by Sri H. Siddaveerappa is that any matter involving finance is official. Every Hon'ble member of this House has a right to move a resolution or Bill regarding any subject, whether it has financial implications or not.

శ్రీ ఎస్. గోపాలగాద.—ననగె ఒందు ఇన్సోఫెర్మషన్ కొదబేకు. ముందిన వషట బజెట్ మందన మాదువుదక్కు నమగె అవకాశ ఒదగిసికొదుత్తేరా?

శ్రీ వాటాల్ నాగరాజు.—ముందిన వషట అకాడెమీ 20 జన నద్దరు ఈ కడెబంద మేల్రి నాచే అదన్ను చూడబహుచు.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—The point is that every hon'ble member has a right to bring a resolution or a Bill, regarding every subject which is included in the list of State subjects specified in the Constitution. That is the legal position. Now, a private business is work which a member of the House brings, whether he is a member belonging to the Congress or any other party on the other side. That is the meaning. Any Motion brought by a member who is not a member of the Government is private members business. Therefore any resolution brought by any member who is not a member of the Government, that is, cabinet can be brought under the rule.

(*Interruptions*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order.

Sri M. G. BANAKAR.—Clarification please.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—I am not yielding. Therefore the Bill brought by Sri Siddiah Kashimath is a private members business, brought as a non-official business. Apart from this, the Business Advisory Committee has considered it and they have given priority to this Bill, and allotted sometime and that report has been approved by the House. Therefore, it is not open to any member to challenge it. Unless that is finished, no other business can be taken up.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಡಿ. ಬಣಕಾರ್. —ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ಶಾಸಕರ ಸಂಬಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನುವ ಇಂಥ ಮನೊದೆ ಇದು ನಾನ್ ಅಧಿಷ್ಠಿತರು ಬಿಡುವೆನ್ನು ಏಂದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇ?

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—Yes, any Bill brought by a private member is a non-official work.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದುಗ್ಗಾಪ್ತ.—ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆಯ ಚರಿತ್ರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂದಿಯಾದ್ಯತದ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಪಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಮೆಂಬರರು ಇಂಥ ಮನೊದೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ? ಎಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಳಿ? ನಾನು ಸ್ವಾಮ್ಮಾನಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಡಿ. ಬಣಕಾರ್. —ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳು ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸಿಂಗ್ ಅಥವಾ ಬಿಡುವೆನ್ನು ತರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. I will give a ruling.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ತಿವತ್ತಿ.—ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ನಾರಿಗೆ ಜನರಲ್ ಅಕ್ಷಯನಿಸ್ತ್ರೋಪನ್ ಹೆಡ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬರತಕ್ಕಿಂಥಾದ್ದು. ಅದೆ ಇದು ಬೇರೆ ಸೆಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಅಂದರೆ ಯಾರು? ಮೆಂಬರ್ ಅಂದರೆ ಯಾರು? ಇದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

Council of Minister selected by the Chief Minister. He is the head of the Council of Ministers. So, this Council of Ministers can be changed according to the whims and fancies of the Leader of the House. It is not so in the case of members. A member is elected once in five years for a full term. So, this clear distinction is there. That is why in the Constitution salaries of the Minister and salaries of the members are brought under two headings.

I bring to your kind notice what is contained in Article 195. It reads as follows :

“ Members of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council of a State shall be entitled to receive such salaries and allowances as may from time to time be determined by the Legislature of the State by law and, until provision in that respect is so made, salaries and allowances at such rates and upon such conditions as were immediately before the commencement of this Constitution applicable in the case of members of the Legislative Assembly of the corresponding Province.”

Then coming to the duties of Council of Ministers the Article 163 reads as follows :

" There shall be a council of Ministers with the Chief Minister as the head to aid and advise the Governor in the exercise of his functions, except in so far as he is by or under this Constitution required to exercise his functions or any of them in his discretion."

Their functions are described here. Then coming to the salaries and allowances of Ministers, they have to be fixed by the fixed by the Legislature of the State by law and until the legislature determines, they have to be paid the salaries as specified under the Second schedule.

ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಏರಡನೆ ಹೇಡುಲ್ಪಲ್ಪಿಡಿಕ್ಕುನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅಸಂಭಳ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾನ್ಸಿಲ್ ನಡವರಿಗೆ ಹಂದೆ ಇದ್ದ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲ, ಅವರ ಮಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ಅರ್ಥ ಹೇಣು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ದಯಿಟ್ಟು ಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಕಾನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಅಥ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರ್‌ಸ್ ಸಂಬಳ ಮತ್ತು ತಾನಕರ ಸಂಬಳ ಇವನ್ನು ಬಿಂಬಿಸಲ್ಪಿಡಿಕ್ಕು ಕೊಡ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಹೆಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಜನರಲ್. ಅಡ್ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಗವರ್ನರ್ ರ್, ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರ್‌ನ್, ಇವರಿಳ್ಳಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಬ್ಬ ಖಾಸಗಿ ಸದಸ್ಯ ಒಂದು ಬಿರು ತಂದು ರಾಜ್ ಧನವನ್ನಾಗಲ್, ರಾಜ್ಯಾಧಿಕಾರ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನಾಗಲ್ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ರಾಜ್ಯಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗೆ ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕು, ಅದರ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಆಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇವತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ಕ್ರೋಪರಾದ ಸಿದ್ಧಿಯ ಕಾಲಿಮಾತ ಅವರು ಬಿಂಬಿಸುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಅಥವಾ ಅಲೋಯೆನ್ನು ಡಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. It is clearly against the principles of budgeting itself. It is purely a Government business. ಇದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯಾಡಳಿತ ಇಲಾಖೆಗೆ ಒಳಪಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿರಬೇಕಾದ್ದು. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಮತ್ತು ಅಲೋಯೆನ್ನು ಡಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬಿಗ್ಗಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಖಾಸಗಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮನೋದೇಹನ್ನು ಮಂಡನ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅಪಾಯಿಕಾರಿ ತತ್ವವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಏರಿಕೆ ಮನೋದೇಹನ್ನು ಖಾಸಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪ ಎಂದು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಬಿಹಳ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅದು ಕಾನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಬಾಹೀಕರವಾಗಿ ತತ್ತದೆ. ಅದುದಿರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳದ ಏರಿಕೆ ಮನೋದೇಹನ್ನು ಖಾಸಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪ ಗೆಳ್ಳಲ್ಪಿಸೇರಿನುವುದು ಕಾನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಬಾಹೀಕರವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ತೀರ್ದಾರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಬೆಳ್ಳಿಯ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನು ಕಾಳಿಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರೆಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point of order is raised by invoking Rule 28. He said that the business is not the Government business and therefore the Bill could not have been brought by a member as Mr. Shivappa contended. It was also mentioned that this being the non-official day this business cannot therefore be taken. Another member contributed another idea that some other work is more important and therefore that should have been given priority and this could be taken later. The members must understand that one reason must be put forth and all members cannot bring all the ideas at a time.

(Some members stood up to speak)

To-day is the last day and if it is necessary I will undoubtedly enforce the rules. If a point of order is raised that member alone is entitled to raise and others should not disturb and should not raise their points of orders in the middle.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಡಿ. ಬಜುಕಾರ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ನಿದ್ದಿಸೀರಪ್ಪ ಸದರು ಕ್ರಿಯಾರ್ಥಿತವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿದಾರ್...
Mr. SPEAKER.—This member is going on imagining things. I have not mentioned his name.

The whole point is whether the business before the House is official or non-official! It might be remembered at what stage this point is raised. It was never said it is official business though vaguely hinted with regard to the contents of the Bill, because the procedure and function followed is one relating to non-official business. If matters contained in the Bill relate to one or two officers or council of Ministers it becomes official is highly fallacious.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, that Bill is not introduced. When did he introduce? If it was introduced it must have been stealthily introduced. We were here. For about 2 minutes we were out.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The members read the proceedings.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Even if it is introduced...

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member is again wrong. To-day it was taken up after it was introduced. I will appeal to every member that nobody should disturb.

MR. AZEEZ SAIT.—What happened was that Sri Siddiah Kasimath has introduced two Bills together. It was wrong. One Bill at a time has to be introduced. The second Bill was not moved. That is what had happened.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am reading the proceedings.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—My we know at what date it was introduced. He wanted to introduce both the Bill. I raised a point of order. I do not know if the bill was introduced to day. Please look into the proceedings. Please refer to the proceedings. You will find what it is.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This kind of thing is highly improper to say the least. Members will find from today's agenda that it will be taken into consideration.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—This is just the time when we can say that it should not be taken up.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Member's thinking is very wrong.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I may be a stupid man. But still I have a right to say that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Whatever is said it must be said correctly.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—According to my conscience, it is correct. If it is wrong, it may be corrected.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is exactly what I want to read. "Laying of Papers; Legislative work—Introduction of Bill—Mysore Legislature Salaries Amendment Bill; Mysore Ministers Salaries and Allowances Amendment Bill, 1967; consideration of Bills."

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—What about the point of order that was raised ? You please refer to that. I perfectly remember that a point of order was raised by me. You were pleased to give a ruling that both cannot be introduced together.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Whoever said that they have been introduced together ? They were introduced one after another.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—My contention is that it was not introduced. Mr. Siddiah Kashimath wanted to introduce both the Bills in one sentence. I raised a point of order that both cannot be introduced together. You also said that they cannot be introduced together. If it is not introduced today, it was not also introduced on the previous day. You may find it out.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am surprised at the assertions that are made. True it is that when Mr. Siddiah Kashimath wanted two Bills to be introduced together, point of order was raised and I upheld that point of order and thereafter the two Bills were introduced one after another.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—No.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What do you mean by saying ‘ No ’ ? I allowed to say. It is your opinion. If anybody thinks that his opinion supersedes the recorded proceedings, I do not know how to mention it.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—I have a right to correct the Speaker if he goes out of the way.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member must say on a Point of order.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—We are not here only to raise points of order. We are here to correct everybody. As I have got a right to correct myself and submit to your decision, I have also a right to correct you if there is anything wrong. Whenever you give a ruling, if we find anything wrong, not on account of any bad intention towards us, but out of heavy work if you say anything out of the way, we have every right to correct you and bring facts to your notice and to remind you about the previous proceedings and then get a better judgment in our own interest. You were kind enough to us and we are very much thankful to you. But at the same time it is our bounden duty whenever you give a ruling or whenever a point of order is ruled out, not only but every member sitting here has a right to say either for or against it. Even at the time of pronouncing your rulings, we have a right to tell you that you are wrong.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Please bear with us. Why should you get restless with us today ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not restless. I read over the proceedings.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The Secretary says that it was introduced on 31st and I have nothing to disbelieve him. Even if it is introduced and even if it is taken into consideration, my objection stands good under rule 28. Please consider it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Therefore Members must realise when I read out the proceedings.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I was under honest impression that it was not introduced.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Member is not bona fide of that opinion, he would not have taken so much of time. The fact is that I have no option but to apply guillotine. Let it not afterwards be said that debate was not allowed.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ನಮಗು ನ್ನೇ ಗಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಬಡಿ !

Mr. SPEAKER.—Even if the Members ask me to put them to ‘galli’ I am not the man. I will try to avoid it. Now it is conceded, at any rate, it has been taken that the Bill has been introduced. I was mentioning if the Bill is not one that has to be introduced as a non-official Bill, objection should have been taken at the very inception. Matters did not remain there. After the Bill was introduced, it was referred to a Committee on Non-official Bills for a Report on allowcation of time. The Committee dealt with it and allotted 3½ hours time for the two Bills together. All this was again discussed in the morning. Without introduction how it could have happened, I do not know. If it is an official Bill, how it could go to that Committee, I am unable to understand. The error appears to be that because it relates to Minister’s salary, which might or might not be passed, and the Ministers in the Treasury Bench form part of the Government, it is official Bill and so it is official work. That is not correct. Whatever might be the distinction between private and public Bill in England, in India there is hardly any distinction between public Bill and private Bill as such. It depends upon the person who brings it. If it is sponsored or introduced by a member who is not a member of the Council of Ministers, then it become non-official. That is why it goes before that Committee. It went there and got the time allotted. Whatever might be the contents of the Bill, if it is sponsored by the Government, then it becomes a Government business. That is how allocation is made between official and non-official. A layman might think that it is official but that view is not correct.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—Hon’ble Minister Sri Kanthi has crossed the floor. I do not know whether he has changed party.

Sri G. BUGGAPPA.—Hon’ble Minister is canvassing. This kind of business should not be allowed to go on under your very nose.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not completed my ruling.

I pointed out the other day that a point of order cannot be raised when I am giving a ruling. I will continue the ruling.

4-00 P.M.

It was also said that Members are entitled for two days for every fourteen days of official businsss. That Member forgot perhaps that

official days and non-official are decided well in advance. It is admitted that it is non-official day today. Non-official business is in its proper place. Even with regard to non-official business, the Members have overlooked the circumstances that as between the Bills and resolutions, Bills take precedence. Further, in the agenda which has been settled, this is placed higher and we have discussed in part. To say that that must be adjourned, must be by a motion accepted by the House. Members are needlessly mixing up ideas and trying to think that this can be pushed back and another thing can be taken.

Mr. Siddiah Kasimath may now move his motion.

శ్రీ ఎస్. గోవాలగౌడ.—జు 28 ర మేరీ తావు ఏను హేళిదిరి, తావు హేళిద ప్రకార రూలంగు అంత తిగెదుకొల్చువుదాదరే అదు వోదరే తీమాఫనచాగితు. అఫిషియల్ డే మాత్రమానానో అఫిషియల్ డే అనువుదర బగ్గె ఎందు తావు హేళిదిరి మాత్రమై ఎరదు మానుదేగలిగే మారూవరే గంచే సెమయ ఒండేందెక్క కోట్టడే ఎందు తావు తీళిసిదిరి మాత్రమై మారూలువరే గంచే జీలోగే జన్ము మారూలువరే గంచే సేరి 7 గంచే బరి ఒందు మానుదేయు మేరీ కళేదు హోగిదే. అఫిషియల్ డే ఎందు బిసినేస్ అడ్యోపనరి కమిషనరు ఒప్పిదే నూలదు, నానో అఫిషియల్ డే దివస ఎనాదరూ బీరే బిసినేస్ మాదబీకాదరేరూల్ను సస్యహేండ్ మాడి అంత అవరు కేళికోళ్ళబేకు, అదన్ను తావు ఒప్పబేకు అంత ఇదే. నానో అఫిషియల్ డే అంత ఇవతు. ఈ మానుదేయున్న తరువాదచే నావు హేళిదవే? తావు స్టుట్టు ఆడోఫర్ ఫీజున్న తిగెదు నోరెడిరే ఎలా గోతాగుత్తదే ఒందు వారదల్లి ఏనేను కాచ్చడేవే ఎంబుదు అదరల్లి ఇదే.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think the point was dealt with in the morning.

శ్రీ ఎస్. గోవాలగౌడ.—నాను హేళువుదు ఈ ఒందు మానుదేగే బిసినేస్ అడ్యోపనరి కమిషనరు చేస్తం అలాడు మాడిల్లి.

అధ్యక్షరు.—బిసినేస్ అడ్యోపనరి కమిషనరు మాదువంతకదు ఏనూ ఇల్లి.

శ్రీ ఎస్. గోవాలగౌడ.—మారూలువరే గంచే కోట్టడైరు అంత హేళిదిరి ఒప్పి కొంచెపు. ఆగ కాలా తీర్మాగిదే. కోపదాగి ఈ మానుదేగే ఎమ్ముకాల గోత్తు మాదబీకేంబుదన్ను తీమాఫన మాదబీకు. అడక్కింత వోదలనేయుదాగి నానో అఫిషియల్ బిసినేస్ అధవా అఫిషియల్ బిసినేస్ అంత తీమాఫన మాగేకు, తావు నానో అఫిషియల్ బిసినేస్ అంత హేళిదిరి. అదర బగ్గె కంచింటస్ ఏనిరబేకేంబుదన్ను తావు ఇచ్చి మాదలిల్లి. నానో అఫిషియల్ అదర కెలవు నియమగళు క్రమగళు ఇచే. అదరంతే బిప్పెత్తస్తున్న మండి మావుదక్క బిరుత్తదేయే? జనరల్ అడ్యోపన్‌పేన్‌గే నంబింధపట్ట బిచు-పేచ్చ వన్ను.....

అధ్యక్షరు.—హేళిద్దన్నే హేళువుదు బేడే.

శ్రీ ఎస్. గోవాలగౌడ.—నాను తమ్ము రూలంగన్ను బ్రతే మాదుత్తిల్లి ఈ విషయ గళ బగ్గె స్ట్రేచ్ వాద మాత్రమైంచాడ ఒందు రూలంగు ఈ పెన్స్యూపేరేవన్స్ గమనదల్లిఱు కొండు కోపువుదు బిచేయిదు. మాత్రమై ఇదక్కే ఆగ అవకాశ కోట్టరూవుదక్క విశేష కారణాలేను అన్ను వుదన్ను కూడ తావు స్టుట్టు తీళిసబేకు.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Gopala Gowda raised a point of order and said some thing. I find there is no point of order arising out of it.

SRI L. SRIKANTIAH.—I rise to a point of order, Sir. Article 163 of the Constitution may kindly be referred to. According to me, the Deputy Minister is no minister at all and he has no status in law inasmuch as Sri Kasimath Siddiah is trying to confer benefits from this amended Bill. I think it is a void piece of legislation. I substantiate the point as follows.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The professor is saying that it contravenes article 163; definition of Council of Ministers?

Sri L. SRIKANTIAH.—In the Council of Ministers, the Deputy Ministers do not come into the picture. In the article 163 of the Constitution, the Deputy Minister has no status in law. If an H n'ble Member is a member of the Council of Ministers, only that person could be regarded as a Minister who has admission to the Cabinet. Now the Council of Ministers is equivalent to the Cabinet of ministers. The Deputy Minister does not sit in th Cabinet. It may be argued that the Deputy Minister deputises on behalf of the Minister in charge.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Minister's salary Bill is already on the Statute book.

Sri L. SRIKANTIAH.—It is a void piece of legislation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not going to decide.

Sri L. SRIKANTIAH.—This House is not going to decide and sit in judgement over it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If this House is not going to decide the *ultra vires* or the *intra vires*, I am not going to decide either.

Sri L. SRIKANTIAH.—I am not asking you to consider and decide unless certain benefits are going to be conferred on Deputy Ministers who have no status in Law, this House cannot be expected to take notice of it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A point of order has been raised by Sri Srikantiah that Deputy Minister is not mentioned in article 163 and this Bill is invalid. I told him that the statute that is already in existence refers to deputy Ministers. Even if it did not refer, his contention is that this is *ultra vires* and he agrees that this House is no final authority. If that is so, I am not going to decide whether it is *ultra vires* or *intra vires*. There is no point of order to be decided by the House, much less by me.

SRI DIGAMBAR RAO BALVANT RAO (Aland).—On a point of order, Sir. There is a resolution tabled by Sri M. S. Krishnan for constituting an expert committee for revising water rates. That resolution is there. There are also other resolutions which are also coming up for consideration. My submission is that in view of rule 27, the Bill that is now put up before this House for consideration is not so important as other resolutions that are to be taken up today. So, my submission is that under rule 27 :

“...Provided that such order of business shall not be varied on the day that business is set down for disposal unless the Speaker is satisfied that there is sufficient ground for such variation.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon. Member Sri Digambar Rao raises a point of order to ignore the agenda and the order in the agenda and to enter

into the demand of relative importance. It is surprising that such a thing should be stated in a point of order. There is absolutely no merit in the point of order raised.

† Sri K. H. PATIL.—I am quoting Rule 29 which is as follows :

“Private Members’ business set down for the day allotted for that class of business and not disposed of on that day shall not be set down for any subsequent day, unless it has gained priority at the ballot held with reference to that day :

“Provided that notwithstanding anything contained in rules 28 and 2, any such business which is under discussion at the end of that day shall be set down for the next day allotted to business of that class, and shall have precedence over all other business set down for that day.”

I am substantiating my point. Now, it has been mentioned here in the Agency as “Private Member’s Business.” Even though the Bill was taken notice of it was not put for discussion till yesterday. I have got here a book in support of my point; I will pass it on to you. What I am making out is that today we have Private Members’ business and the Speaker has to safeguard the interests of the Private Member. The Treasury Benches have got several opportunities to express their ideas in one form or another. But the Opposition lacks such enormous opportunities. The Opposition has no time to suggest constructive remedies. The Treasury Benches move several Bills and they have lot of scope for expressing their opinions. Although this motion is moved by my friend and put in his name, there are more important matters like naming this State as Karnataka, review of water rates, etc. The Opposition should not be deprived of their right to participate in these momentous issues which have been pressed through non-official resolutions.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—I beg to differ from my hon’ble friend who said that we have no chance to make constructive suggestions. All that we have been making is constructive criticism. I presume my friend did not put in the proper form.

Mr. SPEAKER.—My difficulty is that I have so many friends who do not put their ideas in the proper form at all.

Sri K. H. Patil raises a point of order and refers to rules and gives me a book. The book he gives is May’s Parliamentary Practice. The points raised are nothing new. I have dealt with all these points. I have pointed out that a Bill has precedence over resolution. So far as the procedure is concerned, I have a feeling that these points are being raised with a view to see whether there is no rule which has been observed or not. I am glad that constructive suggestions are going to be given. I will rather wait for the debate to see what the constructive criticisms are. And if time is consumed on account of points of order and is not made available for debate, it is the persons who lose the time

(MR. SPEAKER)

that will have to analyse and find whether it was lost for reasons beyond their control or on account of any reasons specially followed in the course of the debate.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—I am a successful mover of point of order and my points of order have been withheld in both the cases of privilege motion. My point of order is interesting.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಹೇಗೆ ರೂ ಬಚ್ಚಿಂಬಿನ್ನರೂ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಅಥ ಅಡಿರನ್ನು ಎತ್ತುವುದಾದರೆ ಅಗ ನಾನು ರೂಲಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನು ತಡೆಹಡಿಯಬೇಕಾಗುವುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಐಸ್. ಸಿದ್ದೇವರಪ್ಪ.—ಅದು ಹೇಗೆ ನಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದು ಹೇಗೆ ನಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಡಿ. ಬಳಕಾರ್ಪ್.—ತಾವು, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಬೆಂಬಲವಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಕ್ರಕ್ರೆತೀ ಮತ್ತು ಮುಂದು ಬೆಂಬಲ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವಂತೆ ನಾವಾಲನ್ನು ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ, ಜಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮೆಚ್ಚಾರಿಯ ಇಲ್ಲದ ನಾಮ್ಮೆ ಪ್ರಕ್ರಕ್ರೆತಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಜ್ಞ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ವರು ಯಾರು, ನಾನ್ನು?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—We respect the Chair. We have got the highest respect to the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to ask one thing. How many points of order have been raised ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—As many as the occasion needs. An occasion like this has not arisen anywhere in any part of the world, in any Parliament or Legislature; namely, the Ministers' Salaries and Allowances enhancement Bill being moved by a Private Member. There is no parallel anywhere in the history of India or in any democracy.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—I raise to a point of order. I will draw your kind attention to Rules 12, 13, 14 and 16. Now we have gone as far as Rules 12, 13 and 14 are concerned. Rule 14 says that "The Assembly shall commence and conclude at such time as the Speaker may from time to time direct." Now we have proceeded very nicely and earnestly up to rule 15. What has happened after Rule 15? The Assembly should conclude at 12.30 today. Please do not misunderstand that I am making any insinuation against the Chair.

Exactly at 12.30 P.M. the Assembly ought to have concluded ; at about 12.26 P.M. the Opposition staged a walk-out. By the time they returned to the Chamber, it was 12.30 P.M. After that the Speaker simply adjourned the House. Actually the members and the Speaker went on arguing and at about 12.35 P.M. or so, the Speaker was pleased to say : 'Now the House stands adjourned and shall meet at 3 P.M.'. It was very improper and illegal according to the rules. However, having directed us to come here, we have come at 3 O'clock. In the name of justice and fairplay and democracy, I only feel sorry that rule 15 was not adhered to. The Speaker had taken a little more power in this behalf. I have already said that I am not insinuating against the Speaker. We are here however well directed or ill-directed

Whatever insinuations and whatever charges that were made from the Treasury Benches, we have tolerated. Though you did not become angry then, whenever a straightforward thing or a honest thing is said from this side, you become angry and raise your voice and say 'order, order'. 'I call the member to order'; 'I will ask the member to retire'. I know you have no grudge against any member. Somehow you will have to control.

According to rule 15, exactly at 12-30 P. M. the House should have been adjourned and not even 12-31 P. M. If a man is to be hanged at a particular hour, he should be hanged exactly at that minute and not even one second late. But, here, the Speaker allowed discussion to continue till 12-35 P. M. and after that he adjourned. Therefore, the proceedings transacted thereafter are illegal and all that has gone into the record has no value and so everything will have to be expunged. You, as an able lawyer, may understand the basic argument of mine.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have reserved my ruling.

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—I rise to a point of order. Can a private member be allowed to take up the floor and transact Government business?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I suppose this is dealt with by the rulings already given.

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—That is our difficulty.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Those difficulties do not overlook the rules. These points are covered by the rulings. If the hon. member has any new point, he may raise. He cannot raise a point of order on my ruling already given.

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—Further the root cause for all this is this. What is happening here since 12-30 everybody knows and your goodself also knows. But, our difficulty is, we cannot express here. The Minister in charge of Parliamentary Affairs should have brought this Bill before the House. We did not know that the Bill is before the House. Now, it is made clear that it was introduced. In a hurry-burry it was introduced.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will not accept any point of order when I call upon Sri Siddaiah Kasimath.

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—In that case, the hon. member will not be allowed to transact business.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it a point of order?

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is over-ruled. Sri Siddaiah Kashimath will speak.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—On a point of order under rule 311 Sir, because under rule 311 it will not amount to a questioning of your ruling ; I want to draw a distinction. Under rule 311 :

“(1) A point of order shall relate to the interpretation or enforcement of these rules or such articles of the Constitution as regulate the business of the Assembly and shall raise a question which is within the cognizance of the Speaker.

“(2) A point of order may be raised in relation to the business before the Assembly at the movement :

“Provided that the Speaker may permit a member to raise a point of order during the interval between the termination of one item of business and the commencement of another if it relates to maintenance of order in, or arrangement of business before, the Assembly.

“(3) Subject to conditions referred to in sub-rules (1) and (2) a member may formulate a point of order and the Speaker shall decide whether the point raised is a point of order and if so gives his decision thereon, which shall be final.”

Here, it can be seen there is no provision in the rule for postponing your decision. Whatever ruling you give, it shall be given here and now because there is no provision in the rule where your ruling can be postponed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is a mandatory point raised by saying that under rule 311, there is no provision for postponing of giving a ruling. With the wealth of his parliamentary experience, if he thinks for the first time that such a situation arises, I can very well understand. Rulings have been postponed. On the other hand, his reading is to impart into it that the ruling shall be given then and there, that day only—that word is not there.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—That it should be postponed is not there. In view of the extraordinary situation, we would request you to give your ruling then and there. I know you are capable of giving it, Sir.

4-30 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am reserving my ruling because I find that there is absolutely nothing which compels the Speaker to give a ruling then and there on the subject. It will be dictating the Speaker to say that the ruling must be given then and there. Rules, if necessary, will have to be modified. If postponement is not there, it does not mean that the ruling should be given then and there. It is well within the experience of the members here that I have reserved my rulings.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಡ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ತಾವು ಅಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಂಥ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ನಾವು ತಿರಸಾವಕಿಸಿ ಬಹುಶೇ. ಆ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಂತೆ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಆಗಿರುವವರು ಯಾವುದೇ ಪಾಠೀಂಜ್ ಅಥ ಆದರೆನ್ನು

ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರಿಜರ್ವ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಅಥವಾ ಕೊಡಲೇ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು). ರಿಜರ್ವ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯೇಗೆ ಯೋಜನೆ ವಿಷಯದ ಸಲ್ಲಾವಾಗಿ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಅಥ್ ಅಡರ್ ರೈಬ್ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಂತರ ಪ್ರೋನ್ ಪ್ರೋನ್ ಮಾಡುವ ನಂತರಕ್ಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಬೇಕು. ಇವತ್ತು ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಅಥ್ ಅಡರ್ ಬಿಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾಳೆಯುವರೆಗೂ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಅಬೋಹೋರ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಶಿರುವಾಗ ಅ ವಿಷಯ ವನ್ನು ನಂತರ ಪ್ರೋನ್ ಪ್ರೋನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆಯಂದು ನಮಗೆ ವೇದ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಉಂಟು. ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಪ್ರೋನ್ ಪ್ರೋನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಂತರ ಪ್ರೋನ್ ಪ್ರೋನ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಹೊದರೆ ತಾವೇ ಪ್ರೀನಪ್ರೋಫ್ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಜೂಡಿಷಿಯಲ್ ದಿನಿಂದ ನಂತರ ಪ್ರೀನಪ್ರೋಫ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಪ್ರಭಾವಭೂತ ತತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ನರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ತಮ್ಮ ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನೇನಾದರೂ ಪ್ರೋನ್ ಪ್ರೋನ್ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾ ಅ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೇ ಪ್ರೋನ್ ಪ್ರೋನ್ ವರಬೇಕು. ನನ್ನ ಸ್ಕೋಹಿತರಾದಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಾಯ್ ಕಾಶಿಮಾರ್ತಿ ಅವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮತ್ತಾದೆ ಏಸಿದೆ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಅಥ್ ಅಡರ್ ರೈಬ್ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರ ನಗ್ಗೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಪ್ರೋನ್ ಪ್ರೋನ್ ಅದರ ಅ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೇ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಲೇ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತೀವ್ರಾರ್ಥವನ್ನೂ ನಂತರ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸಲಹಾ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble member Sri K. H. Patil suggests that there is much less power for the Speaker to postpone giving a ruling and he suggests that if a ruling is to be postponed it must be for a particular time. It is well known principle that hypothetically Speaker never gives any ruling. When a point arises that point has to be decided and if that point is put I feel it is to be decided then and there and I decide. I am unable to agree with any hypothetical point being put as point of order. One of the essential things that is stated relating to the point of order is those points that arise at the moment and it is also stated that a member shall not rise a point of order to ask for information, to explain his position. So to say 'when a question of motion being put', is hypothetical.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—Sir, what about my point ? It is a strong point of order. Rules 14 and 15 are violated. The Speaker ought to have adjourned the House at 12-30 P.M. that point of order is not decided.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member has stated all that he had to say.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—I may not be an LL.B., or B.L. As a member of the Assembly.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not know whether this is the kind of respect for democracy the member wants to exhibit.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—I have respect to the Chair. But what I wish to say is at 12-30 P.M. you should have adjourned the House. As it is not done rules 15 and 16 have been violated. That is the point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A point of order has been raised and I have stated that I am reserving my ruling. The point of order is that the whole meeting is illegal.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—Otherwise it is a serious matter.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order.....Sri Siddiah Kashimath.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—1956ನೇ ಇನಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೇ ತರಹ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಏರಿಕೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಮನೋದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು. ತಾವು ಅಗಿನ ಸದವಳಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ನೋಡಿದರೆ There is a point of procedure. What was the procedure that was adopted on that day? I request you to adopt the same procedure. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಏರಿಕೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆಗ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಯಾರು ಇದ್ದರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ. ಆಗ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಯಾರು ಹೊತ್ತಿದ್ದರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಗೂತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಜನರಲ್ ಅಡ್ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್ ಅಡಳಿತದ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಹೊತ್ತಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿದೆ ಇರುವಾಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿಕ್ಕಿಂಧ ಚಾನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಅದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆಗಲೂ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ನಿಜಲಂಗಪ್ಪನವರು ಈ ಮನೋದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಟೀಕೆ ಕಿಪ್ಪಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಅಡಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಜನರಲ್ ಅಡ್ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್ ಪನ್ನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿಕ್ಕಿಂಧ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇ ಆಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇವು. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ನನ್ನ ಸ್ವೀಕಿತರಾದಂಥ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಾಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶಿಪುತ್ರ ಅವರು ಈ ಮನೋದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕಾಗಿ ಗುವಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಹಣಕಾಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿಕ್ಕಿಂಧ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿಕ್ಕಿಂಧ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಎತ್ತಿದಾಗ ಈ ಒಂದು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಹೊತ್ತಿರಂಥ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇ ಅಡಕ್ಕೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಅವರೇ ಅದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಅದವಾ ಅವರ ಪರಿಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಅದವರಾದರೂ ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. Are you following the same convention? ಹಂಡೆ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಇಂತಹ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರಿಂತಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿ ಪ್ರೇರಿತ ವೆಂಬರ್ಥ ಇಂತಹ ಹಣಕಾಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿಕ್ಕಿಂಧ ಮನೋದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿರಲ್ಲಿ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿಕ್ಕಿಂಧ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇ ಮಂಡಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಮನೋದೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿಕ್ಕಿಂಧ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲಿದೆ ಆಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿದೆ ಇರುವಾಗ ನಾವು ಕೇಳಲಿತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೂ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಇವತ್ತು ಯಾರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕು? ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದಾಯ್ಯಪ್ಪ.—ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಅಥ್ ಅರ್ಫರ್ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ಯಾವ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಅಥ್ ಅರ್ಫರ್ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದಾಯ್ಯಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಹಣಕಾಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿಕ್ಕಿಂಧ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಈ ಬಾತಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿಕ್ಕಿಂಧ ಪರ ಮನೋದೆ ಬಂದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪರ್ವತನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಅಥ್ ಅರ್ಫರ್. 1,200 ರೂಪಾಯಾಗಳೇ ವೇತನವನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಯಾರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ? 1,200 ರೂಪಾಯಾಗಳೇ ನಾಕು ಅಧಿವಾರ 900 ರೂಪಾಯಾಗಳೇ ನಾಕು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಕೇಳುವವರು ಯಾರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it a Point of Order?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಬಿ. ಬಣಕಾರ್.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಹಣಕಾಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿಕ್ಕಿಂಧ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಮಾಜ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇ ಅದರಿಂದ ಅದರಿಂದ ಹಣಕಾಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿಕ್ಕಿಂಧ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಬೇಕು. ಹಂಡಿದೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅನುಮಾನಗಳನ್ನಾಗಲೇ ಅಧಿವಾರ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವವನ್ನಾಗಲೇ ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅವರನ್ನೇ ಕೇಳಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಯಾವ ರೂಲ್ ತ್ವರಿತಗೊಳಿಸಿ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಬಿ. ಬಣಕಾರ್.—ನಾವು ಕಾನೂನಾಗಳನ್ನು ಕ್ರೆಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಹುಟ್ಟೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಈ ಬಾತಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿಕ್ಕಿಂಧ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನೇ ಕೇಳಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಮಾಜ ಯಾವಿ ಇದೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಾಳೆ ವಿಷಯದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ ಹಣಕಾಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿಕ್ಕಿಂಧ ಮನೋದೆಯನ್ನು ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಾಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶಿಪುತ್ರ ಅವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕು? ತಮ್ಮ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿ ಒಂದು ಕೇಳುವ ವಿಷಯದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರು ಕವಿಲ್ಲದ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬಾಹಾರೀ ವಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದಾರೆ. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾರ್ಥಕನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಬಿಳ್ಳನ್ನು ಆಗ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಡಿ. ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿ ಬಂಬಿಸಿವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಬಿಳ್ಳನ್ನು ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಘೋಷಿಸಿಲ್ಲದೆ,

ಬೇರೆಂಬು ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿದಾರೆ. ಇವೆತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನ ಹೊಸ್ಟೆಗೆ ಅನ್ನವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ನಾಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಥಾ ನಮ್ಮುದಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರು ಕಗಲುದರೇಳೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am surprised that this member goes on talking like this.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—Somebody from the Congress Benches has said that the Opposition has no commonsense. Is it parliamentary?

(*Many members were simultaneously shouting*)

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಚೌಡ್ಯ.—ನಾನು ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ತುಂಬಿ ವಿಧವಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡೆ, ಅಗ ವಾತಾವರಣ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಇನ್ನೂಂದು ದಿವಸ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಅದ್ದಿಂದ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟ ತಾವು ಅಗಲಾದೂರೂ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ, ಹೋಸ್ಟ್‌ಪೋಲ್‌ನ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರಿಗೆ ಗೌರವ ಬಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ನಾನು ಏನಿಯಿಂದ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Some little expression of opinion to indicate discontent is all right. I feel it is wrong to allow any latitude or violation of the rules. I will strictly enforce the rules.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಹುಡ್ಡಿಮಾಸ್ತಿ ಗೌರ.—ನಾನು ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಏರೋಧ ಪ್ರಕ್ರಿಯೆ ಮಾನ್ಯಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಉಂಟಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಂನೋ ವಾಕುಲತೆಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ಬೇಂಬಿರಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ತಮಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪ್ರಕ್ರಿಯೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ನಚೆತರಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಅಗ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡಿ, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ಶಾಂತಿ ವಾತಾವರಣ ಬಂದಾಗ ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಷ್ಣೆಯಿದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಿರಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಹನ್ನೆಯನವರೂ ಇದೇ ಅಭಿಪೂರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದಾರೆ. ಅದ್ದಿಂದ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದಾಡುವುದು ಒಷ್ಣೆಯಿದೆ ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—It cannot be adjourned at all.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the House wants, I have to sit, but to carry to extreme lengths and say, “We are dissatisfied; we are not contented; we are not happy and therefore the House should be adjourned.” will be not at all respecting the decision of the House.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—We are happy and we are very much contented.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—As far as I can remember, right from the beginning we have been imploring them and telling them ‘Please move this measure yourself and don’t try to introduce some element which is not healthy’. We have been telling them that this is not correct; still they persist. Therefore, there is no other alternative. Please do not mistake us.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not the judge; the public is the judge.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Our patience is getting exasperated; it is coming to breaking point.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Therefore, what should I do?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—We will see what the consequences will be; that is different.

MR. SPEAKER.—I call upon Sri Siddaiah Kasimath to speak.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಜಿನ್‌ಯ್ಯ.—6 ಗಂಡೆಯಮೇಲೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ನಾವು ತಯಾರಿಸ್ತು ಎಂದು ಒತ್ತಿ ಒತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ಚಿನ್ಹಣೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ನಭಿಯನ್ನು ಅಡ್‌ಜರ್ನಲ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—Sir, I rise on a point of order. It is under Rule 29. Rule 29 says :

“ Private Members’ business set down for the day allotted for that class of business and not disposed of on that day shall not be set down for any subsequent day, unless it has gained priority at the ballot held with reference to that day ”

MR. SPEAKER.—There is no ballot because there are no other Bills.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—Then, Sir, I wish to invite the attention of the House to sub-clause (2) I of rule 28 which refers to Bills to be introduced, Bills returned by the Governor under Article 200 or 201 of the Constitution and so on and so forth. In fact, he is now trying to move the motion for the consideration of this Bill. He has not yet been allowed to move it.

MR. SPEAKER.—He has already moved the consideration motion.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—Even then rule 28 (2) (a) says :

“ On the days allotted for Private Members’ business in any session, unless any days have been allotted under sub-rule (1) for any particular class of business when business of that class shall have precedence, the business shall be taken up in the following order :... ”

I may kindly be permitted to bring to your notice that this does not specify any Bill which is to be moved for the consideration of this House. Secondly, under rule 29 this was not the Bill that was taken up yesterday and continued for today and rule 29 does not say that because there was only one Bill, it is not necessary to hold any ballot.

MR. SPEAKER.—What should have been done then ?

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—It should not have been taken up today and only the resolution that is standing in the name of Sri T. R. Shamanna should have been taken up.

MR. SPEAKER.—The hon’ble Sri Ranganath raised a point of order that this Bill should not have been taken up today. These points, if any, should have been taken up much earlier. It is too late in the day to raise them now. Apart from that, I do not want any member to have a feeling that the point raised by him has not been properly dealt with. Non-official business can be of two kinds primarily, namely, Bills and resolutions. Between these Bills and-resolutions, Bills have precedence over the resolutions. I have already said that. Then it will be seen that inasmuch as resolutions are always more in number, ballot has been held and so this debate does not arise now. As regards, Bills, this is the only

Bill that is now outstanding and that Bill has priority over the resolutions and it has been so done in the agenda and the agenda has been sent to members and we have been doing business according to that agenda. If at this stage the point is raised that this should not have been done, I should feel that there is no merit in that. Sub-rule (4) says:

“Subject to the provisions of sub-rule (2) Bills which have been introduced shall be so arranged as to give priority to Bills which are most advanced.”

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—Sub-rule (2) (a) (i) deals with only “Bills to be introduced”. This is a Bill for consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please see sub-rule (4) (i) “Bills which have been introduced”.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—Sub-rule (3) says: “The Speaker may, by special order to be announced in the Assembly, make such variations in the relative precedence...”

Mr. SPEAKER.—That means, if it is included in the agenda, that has been invoked.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—This is not a Bill to be introduced, but this is a Bill to be moved for consideration of the House. Sub-rule (3) says: “The Speaker may, by special order to be announced in the Assembly...” My submission to you is that this was not announced yesterday in the Assembly. In fact, it was just included in the agenda. My submission is that it was not announced that this Bill would be taken up today. It is true that you have the power to vary the relative precedence by a special order, but that order should have been announced in the Assembly as per this sub-rule. That is my submission because the sub-rule says “The Speaker may, by special order to be announced in the Assembly...”. That should have been done yesterday itself.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sub-rule (4) which says :

“Subject to the provisions of sub-rule (2), Bills which have been introduced shall be so arranged as to give priority to Bills which are most advanced.”

These two Bills have already been introduced. The rule further says :

“The relative precedence of Bills which are at the same stage shall be determined by ballot held on such day and in accordance with such procedure as the Speaker may prescribe.”

I can understand the objection by the member if there were at least two or three other Bills which are at the same stage. But there is only one Bill now and so this question does not arise.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—You were pleased to say that because we had only one Bill it was not taken up by ballot. If rule 28 is read with rule 29 you will see that ballot should have been held.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Ballot arises if there is more than one Bill and not otherwise.

Sri T. R. SHAMANNA.—Sir, I rise to a point of order. Under rule 226 the Business Advisory Committee allots time for each business to be conducted in the House. The Business Advisory Committee allotted 3 hours for the two Bills, namely the Members Salaries Bill and the Ministers Salaries Bill. The time of 3 hours allotted has been exceeded and so *ipso facto* this particular business has to stop at that stage and the next business on the agenda has to be taken up. I request you, therefore, to see that no more discussion takes place on this. The water problem is a burning problem in Bangalore City. Instead of giving precedence to that, where is the urgency for passing the Ministers Salaries Bill? It can wait. So I submit let this water prob'lem be settled first and in the next session or the adjourned meeting the Ministers Salaries Bill can be considered.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not concerned with the matter of convenience. I have to decide the point of order.

Sri. T. R. SHAMANNA.—My submission is that if the time allotted by the Business Advisory Committee for these Bills is over, then they have again to go before the Business Advisory Committee and that committee has to allot further time and then it has to be taken up here and not otherwise.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point of order of Sri Shamanna is that some other work is more important and that the time which was intended for this business has been spent and so that other business should be taken up being relatively more important. I do not think there is any point of order in it.

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—Sir, I rise to a point of order.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, I request your permission to move a motion of very great importance.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I cannot give Sri Sivappa permission until I have finished this work. The prescribed procedure must be followed. Simply because he wants to move something, I cannot allow it.

†Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—The point of order I have raised is under rule 311 (2) read with rule 28 (vi) and rule 29. First of all, I may kindly be allowed to deal with rule 311 (2). Sir, clause (2) of Rule 311 reads as follows:—

“A point of Order may be raised in relation to the business before the Assembly at the moment:”

So, clause (2) of Rule 311 deals with the actuai busines set down for the day.

5-00 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In the settlement of the business which has been done prior!

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—I wish to draw your kind attention to Rule 28 clause (6), which says:

“Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-rules (1) to (4) of this rule or in rule 133 the Speaker may, on any day allotted for Private Member business, give priority to any item of such business at the request of the member in charge.”

Rule 29 says :

“Private Members’ business set down for the day allotted for that class business and not disposed of on that day shall not be set down for any subsequent day, unless it has gained priority at the ballot held with reference to that day :

Provided that notwithstanding anything contained in Rules 28 and 29 any such business which is under discussion at the end of that day shall be set down for the next day allotted to business of that class, and shall have precedence over all other business set down for that day.”

In this connection.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Was the Member attentive when some other Member argued the same point ?

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—Sir, it is a new point, which has got some other nature. Under sub-rule (6) of Rule 28, you will be pleased to see that the Private Members’ business will have to have its own priority. Further, it may please be considered that in the business of the day, there have been Resolutions set down for the consideration of this House, and the Ministers’ Salaries Bill, which has already been introduced on the Floor of this House by Sri Siddaiah Kashimath has already consumed most of the time allotted for Private Members’ business. In view of this, if that Bill is to be considered by this august House, then the Resolutions which have been set down for consideration will be lapsed, because under Rule 29 if this Bill is allowed to be considered or a discussion is allowed on this Bill, the entire time set down will be consumed by the discussion of that Bill. Therefore, the Resolutions which have been on the Agenda will not be considered at all on the Floor of this House. Also, please consider this aspect of the matter that there are a number of Resolutions and amongst them the most important is that which pertains to the abolition of Land Revenue. Therefore, I submit for your kind perusal and also consideration that the Resolution which deals with abolition of Land Revenue in our State will have the utmost importance when compared to the importance of the Bill for raising the salaries of Ministers. If the Resolutions set down for consideration of this House are allowed to lapse, the very purpose or importance will be taken away, because the people of our State are looking forward that this Resolution is important, and if it is allowed to lapse, the people of our State will be much harassed and they will ask us what

(SRI S. BANGARAPPA)

we are doing, what is this democracy and all that. This Bill is moved by an Opposition Member, because he has been almost purchased by the Treasury Benches.

SRI SIDDAIAH KASHIMATH.—Sir, I cannot tolerate this. Nobody has purchased me so far as I am concerned.

MR. SPEAKER.—Who said like that?

SRI SIDDAIAH KASHIMATH.—Nobody has purchased me so far. But, the Hon'ble Member, Sri Bangarappa mentioned that I have been purchased by the Treasury Benches.

MR. SPEAKER.—Did Sri Bangarappa say that Sri Sidlaiah Kashimath has been purchased?

SRI S. BANGARAPPA.—Sir, I may be permitted....

MR. SPEAKER.—Did he say it or not? Kindly tell me 'Yes' or 'No'.

SRI S. BANGARAPPA.—Sir, that purchasing is according to me is that he has been influenced....

SRI SIDDAIAH KASHIMATH.—Nobody has influenced me in this regard, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER.—Order, Order. It is unbecoming for any Member, whosoever he might be, to say that he has been purchased.

SRI L. SRIKANTAIAH.—Even if he has said, what harm is there, Sir? After all, Sri Bangarappa has spoken the truth; the truth is there.

MR. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Member Sri L. Srikantaiah is always generous, moderate and restraint. He thinks that he can speak when I am on my legs. He should not do that. When I say that I object to the word, what does it mean? I do not think indecency could go further to say that one Member has been purchased by another Member. If he has said that, he will kindly withdraw.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—He may be permitted to explain.

MR. SPEAKER.—Order, Order! Members go on using expressions and say that he will explain, he did not mean like that, etc. Will the House go on spending time like this?

SRI V. N. PATIL.—Sir, I may be permitted to say a few words.

MR. SPEAKER.—Order, Order, I am not allowing.

SRI V. N. PATIL.—Are we not entitled even to make a request to you, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER.—What is that request?

SRI V. N. PATIL.—Before penalising somebody, the Chair has full powers to consider whether he is justified in saying like that. He may

be given a chance to explain, and if you feel satisfied with the explanation, the question of withdrawing does not arise.

Mr. SPEAKER—A request has been made and in so making the request, Sri Patil seems to be sitting in judgment. He thinks that an opportunity might be extended to Sri Bangarappa to explain his position. Sri Siddaveerappa made the same point. I said that Sri Bangarappa may withdraw the word if he has said. *Prima facie*, it is absolutely incorrect to use such words by any Member to any other Member.

Sri S. BANGARAPPA—Sir, no doubt, I have used that word. But, it was not my intention to harm personally Sri Siddaiah Kashimath in this context. What I meant was that he has been influenced or induced or persuaded by the Treasury benches. Therefore, I submit that if my words have really hurt the feelings of Sri Siddaiah Kashimath

Mr. SPEAKER—Don't put it in a qualified manner. Is he expressing regret or apologizing or not?

Sri S. BANGARAPPA—Sir, if.....

Mr. SPEAKER—I do not want 'if'.

Sri S. BANGARAPPA—If Sri Siddaiah Kashimath feels that he is hurt, I am prepared.....

Mr. SPEAKER—I call upon Sri Bangarappa to unconditionally withdraw the words. Will he or not?

Sri S. BANGARAPPA—Sir, I respect the Chair, I withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER—Sri Siddaiah Kashimath may kindly overlook it.

Sri S. BANGARAPPA—Sir, I was dealing with the importance of Rule 29 and also Rule 28 which refer to Private Members business. The Bill of Sri Siddaiah Kashimath was set down for this day and it has already consumed the time allotted to it. It cannot be given any further time. Therefore, I want a ruling on this point and also I want to remind you that you have got discretionary powers. Therefore, I appeal to you to use your discretionary powers and extend time.

Mr. SPEAKER—Point of order was ultimately reduced to an appeal to me to use of my discretion. I have made abundantly clear that I have no discretion in this matter. Same points were raised by others and the ruling has been given. Repeated point of orders are coming forward. I do not know whether it is the right use of the privilege given to the Members to raise points of orders. Raising the same point does not come with great efficacy. Mr. Siddaiah Kashimath.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಧ್ಯಯ ಕಾರ್ಯವರ್ತ—ನಾನು ಅಗರೇ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಈ ವಿಷಯದೊಮ್ಮೆನ್ನು ಒಟ್ಟು ತೋಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT—I raise a point of order, Sir. My point of order is that the Business Advisory Committee allotted 3½ hours for two Bills viz., Member's Salary and Allowances Bill and the Ministers Salary and Allowances Bill. Now instead of 3½ hours more than 8 hours were

(SRI AZEEZ SAIT)

consumed for discussion on Members Salary Bill. This morning you were kind enough to say that 1½ hours more will be given for this and later on you suggested that even 1½ hours may not be sufficient and it may require a little more.

Mr. SPEAKER.—My time to shut out this time has not yet come.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—Instead of 1½ hours, a little more time may be granted to us. If two hours are granted, it would be 7-15 p.m. But the time allotted to this business is lapsed. Therefore the other business is lapsed. Therefore the other business on the Agenda must be taken up.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Under Rule 322, I request you to suspend the Rule 153 (a) and (b).

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not suspending any rule.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದಾವೇರಪ್ಪ.—ಅ ಬಿಂಗ್ ಮೂವ್ ವಾರ್ಡಿಂಗ್ 15 ದಿನಗಳ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ರೂಲ್ ನೆನ್ಯೆಂಡ್ ವಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅವೇ ರೀತಿ ನವಾಗಾಗಿ ಆ ನುದಭ್ರದ್ದು ರೂಲ್ ನೆನ್ಯೆಂಡ್ ವಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI H.SIDDAVEERAPPA.—As and when an occasion arises, we have got inherent right to request the Chair to suspend any rule. 15 days was necessary and that 15 days notice has been waived by your goodself. You have done it in the case of some Bill. Extend the same charity for us and waive this Rule 322.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the request is to come under different circumstances I do not know. I do know that I have got something in writing. It is defective in more than one aspect.

Sri. H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—We have given a correct one to the Secretary. I know it should not be addressed to the Speaker but to the Secretary.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not suspending any rule until this work is over.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ರೂಲ್ 322 ಶ್ರೀಕಾರ ನಬಿಬಾಧಾರ್ಯ ಕೆಲವು ನ್ಯಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ನೆನ್ಯೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಬೆದಾಯ ಕೋರಿತದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಆ ಸಭೆಯು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಏರೋಧಾಗಿ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತ್ವಾನ್ವಯ ಅನ್ವಯ ಆಗ ವಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಅವೇಕ್ಕಿಸಬುತ್ತೇನೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೂಡಬೇಕೆಂದು 15 ದಿನ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದಿದೆ, ಆ ರೂಲು ನೆನ್ಯೆಂಡ್ ವಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಗಂಭೀರವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ, ಮಾನವೀಗೆ ಬಂದಂತೆ ಮಾತನಾಡ ಬೇಡಿ, ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಗಂಭೀರವಾಗಿಯೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾನೂ ಗಂಭೀರವಾಗಿಯೇ ಶತ್ರು ಕೆಡುತ್ತೇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಇಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಡುವರೆ ಗಂಭೀಗೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಕ್ರಾಯಿಕ್ ಕ್ರಾಯಿ ಮಹಿಳೆಗಳಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇಂದು ಆ ಅಧಿವೇಷನದ ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನ. ಅದರೆ ಇಂದು ತಾವು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಒತ್ತಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಮಂಳಿದು ಅವಾರದವರವಾಗಿ ಇಂಥ ಪುನಿಧೆ ತಂದು, ನಿಯಮಗಳನ್ನೀರಿ.

ಉಪ್ಪಂಥಿಕ, ಜರ್ಮನಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡದೆ, ಒಣ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಡರೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಕಾಚ್ಯಾ ಪ್ರಾಜ್ಯಾರಿ ಇತ್ತೀಚ್ಯಾ ಎಂಬ ಬಹುಮತುಂವ ಈ ಮನೋದೇ ವಾಪು ನಾವಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರು. ನಭೀ ಮನು ಮಾರು ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಕರೆದು ಇಷ್ಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿನ ದರ್ಶಕೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಸಾಫ್ತಿ, ಸದವ್ಯಕೆಯನ್ನು ಡಿಫೆನ್ಡೇರಾಗಿದೆ.

MR. SPEAKER.—Order, order.

SRI S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Point of order Sir,

MR. SPEAKER.—Please sit down. There is a point of order.

(*The Member did not yield*)

MR. SPEAKER.—If the Member cannot yield, I have to ask him to retire.

(*The Member resumed his seat*)

SRI S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Mr. Speaker Sir,

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹೆನ್ನೆ ಯ್ಯಾ. — ಸಾರ್ವಾಯಿ, ಕೋರ್ಟ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇದಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ನಿದ್ದಿಂದ್ರಪ್ಪ. — ನಾನು ಈ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಏಕ ಇಷ್ಟು ಕೋರ್ಟೀ. ಏಷ್ಟು ಏತಕೆ, ಇಷ್ಟು ಕೋರ್ಟ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇದಿರಿ ! ಇಡನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಬ್ಬವೇ ?

ಕೋರ್ಟವೆಂಬುದನಾರ್ಥ ನಾಧನ
ಕೋರ್ಟವೇ ಸಂಸಾರ ಬಿಂದುನ
ಕೋರ್ಟದಿಂದಿಹ ರಾರಿದ ಸುಕೃತವು ಲಯವನ್ನೆದುವಡು
ಕೋರ್ಟವನು ವರ್ಚನಲು ಬೇಕುದು
ಕೋರ್ಟವು ನಾವಾನಾಗಲ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮದರಕೆ ಚಿಕ್ಕಿಸ್ತೆಂದನಾ ಎವರಿ

SRI S. D. KOTHAVALA.—My point of order relates to 231. The points of orders and discussion that is going on are totally against the decision taken by this House under 231 this morning. When the question arose up to what time the House should sit for the consideration of the Bill, Hon'ble Speaker was pleased to put that motion before the House to take a decision till what time we should sit. It was then decided that this House should sit till the present Bill relating to Ministers' Salaries and Allowances is considered and passed. That was the only motion for which the present extension is available. Therefore whatever recommendations made by the Business Advisory Committee relating to the non-official work has to be carried out and done here. We have come here to decide the question of Ministers' Salaries and Allowances as per the decision taken under Rule 231. It reads as follows :

“ No variation in the Allocation of Time order shall be made except on a motion made with the consent of the Speaker and accepted by the Assembly : ”

Provided that the Speaker may, after taking the sense of the Assembly, increase the time, not exceeding one hour, without any motion being moved.”

(SRI S. D. KOTHAVALA)

Now the point is, on a motion put by the Hon'ble Speaker himself, the House has decided that the Ministers' Salaries and Allowances Bill should be considered and passed. Therefore, there is no other point. That of course cannot be disregarded, and the appeal to the Hon'ble Speaker for suspending any rule does not arise in view of the decision made by this House this morning. I submit with due respect to the Chair, the Speaker has no power to suspend the rule.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—What about Rule 322?

SRI S. D. KOTHAVALA.—Under Rule 231, an explicit decision is taken by this House that this House should sit for the purpose of consideration and passing of this Bill. Therefore, no other business can be transacted and the Hon'ble Speaker has no power to suspend the rule. There is no question of exceeding the time also under the proviso.

SRI S. GOPALA GOWDA.—Rule 231 proviso says that, the Speaker may, after taking the sense of the Assembly increase the time not exceeding one hour without any motion being moved.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—At 12.30 p.m. this morning we adjourned. The rule specifically says that for extension there should be a motion. Rule 31 says that no variation in the allocation of time order shall be made except on a motion made with the consent of the Speaker and accepted by the Assembly. If I could submit, Sir, there was no motion in the morning to extend the time at 12.30 p.m. You were pleased to take the sense of the House and decide that the sitting should continue, that means to say, to continue the Assembly from 12.30 onwards. But, Sir, subsequently somehow you said we adjourn now and meet at 3 p.m. That should not have been done because even under the proviso, we could have given you power to sit for not more than one hour.

MR. SPEAKER.—What is the time allocation?

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—Upto 12.30 p.m. this morning. According to Committee's decision, it is 3½ hours. That is over long back. No motion is made this morning to extend time. But you took the sense of the House and continued the session. Subsequently you adjourned and asked us to meet at 3 p.m. To extend the time, there should have been a motion. There was no motion from anybody in this House to extend beyond 12.30 p.m. In fact we should not have met at 3 O'clock and we should not have deliberated also. Ruling should be given on that aspect.

MR. SPEAKER.—One more point of order has been raised by Mr. Ranganath.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—I am only supporting the point of order. He was interpreting the rule to his advantage.

MR. SPEAKER.—It is a kind of shifting ground. Mr. Ranganath says there is no point of order. Therefore, I am not giving any ruling. He wants me to understand the point of order raised by Mr. Kothavale;

he supports him and refers to rule 231. He is under the impression, that according to this rule, the House should have been adjourned at 12-30, and therefore any meeting thereafter is improper because there was no motion. Considerable confusion is introduced into that point. Allocation of time order is only with regard to allocation of time with regard to the particular items of business either by the Business Advisory Committee or by the Committee for Non-official Business. In other words, a particular item or a Bill is given 3½ hours; a resolution is given 2 hours. That is what is called allocation of time. That report comes before the House and the House adopts it. It has nothing to do with regard to the time at which the House is to be adjourned. There is no rule which says that at 12-30 under all circumstances, the House becomes powerless to transact any other business. Another idea is, if time is allotted to a Bill or any works is consumed by something else, the Bill goes to the wall or there is no time. I do not know where all these things are got. Anyway, rule 231 is one which says about time allocation order and the decision of the House this morning is that this will be taken up and finished to day. The sense of the House has been gathered and that is why it has been adjourned. The idea proceeds that that time allocation means time allocation of the House.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಜ್‌ಪಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ.—ಎರಡು ದಂಡನಾದಾ ಕಾನೂನು ಬುದ್ದವೇಲೆ ತಾಂತ್ರ ಎಷ್ಟು ಚೈಪ್ಪಂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಿರ್ ಎಂದು ಸಹಿಗಿ ಅವಕ್ಕೆಯು. ಎರಡು ಬ್ಲ್ಯಾಕ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಚೈಪ್ಪಂ ಎಷ್ಟು ಅರ್ಥ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ಪೂರ್ವದೇ ? ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ವಾಣಿ ಕಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದರೆ ಚೈಪ್ಪಂ ಮುಗಿಯಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲ ಧ್ಯಾಯೋ ಇಷ್ಟವೇ ಗೊತ್ತಾ? ನೀತ್ಯದ್ವ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will have it analysed and supplied to the Member in due course.

Sri SIDDAIH KASHIMATH.—I move the Bill for acceptance of the House.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—I have given notice under Rule 73 (2).

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then the Member may move the amendment.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—I beg to move :

“That the Bill be circulated for the purpose eliciting public opinion by 1st February 1968.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting public opinion by 1st February 1968.”

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—You did not give ruling on my point. I have given notice of a motion under Rule 153.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If it is a point of order, I will hear it.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I have given notice of no confidence motion against this Ministry under Rule 153. I request you to permit me to move this motion.

5-30 P.M.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ರಂಗನಾಥ.—ಶ್ಯಾಮಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸರ್ವತ್ವರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಶಿವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ನಂಬಿಗಳಾಗಿರುವುದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ವಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಂದಿರತತ್ವ ಮಂಗಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಗಳದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವರು ಸಾರ್ವಜ್ಞರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಕೃಷ್ಣರು ಇವುಗಳನ್ನಿಂದ ದಿವಸ ನಾವು ನೀಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಈಗೆ ಮುಕ್ತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಇತ್ತರ ಬಹು ವಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಹಾ ಯಥೀಷ್ಟುವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಾವು ಅರ ಮಂಬಾಗಿದೆ, ಅವರ ಅಳುಕಾರು ಅರ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ತಾತ್ಕಾರ್ಯ ವಸ್ತುಗಳಿಗೆ ಯಥೀಷ್ಟುವಾಗಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕೊಷತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೇ. ಈ ಒಂದು ಮಂಬಾದೆ ಕಾರ್ಯವಾದ ಪಕ್ಷವ್ಯಾಪಕ ಬೀಕೃತರ್ಕೆ ಪರಾರೂಪಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯ ರೂಪಾಯಿಸಬ್ಯಾ ಹೇಳುವುದೋ ಬೀಳುತ್ತದೆ ಹಂತ ಒಂದು ಆಧಾರಣೆ, ಕೊಳ್ಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಒಂದು ಕಾಲವ್ಯಾಪಕ ನಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಗಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ನೌಕರಿಯ ಕರ್ಮ ಸಂಖ್ಯಾ ಪಾರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬೀಡಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂತ್ರಾರ್ಥ ಮಂಬಾದೆ ಇಚ್ಛಾಗ್ಯ ಒಂದು ಅಂದೋಽನ ನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದಾಗಿ, ಅಂದೋಽನ ಪಾದಿದಂಥ ಮೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ದಿವಸಗಳನ್ನು ರಜಾ ಅಗಿ ಪರಿಗಣತರ್ವೇಷ್ಟಿ ಏನು ಹಿಂದಿರುವುನ್ನು ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮುಂದಿನ್ನು ಇಚ್ಛಿ ಅವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಕ್ಕಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ಶೋದ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮ್ಲಾ ಶದ್ವರ್ತಾದ ಕೊಡತ ಅಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಕ್ಕಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ಶೋದ ಅಂತಹ ಮಂಬಾದೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಅವು ಕೂಲಿದಂತಹ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಮಂಬಾದೆ ನಿಂದ ಇಚ್ಛಾ ದಿವಸ ನಾವು ನೀಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಈ ಪಕ್ಷವ್ಯಾಪಕ ಹಣವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾನ್ಯ ಪ್ರೇರಿಸಿದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಿಸಿದ್ದೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—I rise to a point of order. My learned brother on the left side wants to move a motion for circulation. But Rule 73 says:

"When a Bill is introduced, or on some subsequent occasion, the Member in charge may make one of the following motions in regard to his Bill, namely..."

Now under this rule, the Bill has been introduced and it is under consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please see rule 73 (2) :

"(2) At this stage no amendments to the Bill may be moved, but if the Member in charge moves that the Bill be taken into consideration, any Member may move as an amendment that the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by a date to be specified in the motion."

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—Sub-clause (3) of Rule 73 says that the details of the Bill shall not be discussed further than is necessary to explain its principles. The mover is not allowed to talk. He has not stated anything.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He should have raised it before I gave permission.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಂ. ರಾಗನಾಥ.—ರೊಬ್ಬ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ನೌಕರರು ಏರಡು ಮೂರು ದಿವಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಮೃತ್ಯು-ವನ್ನು ವಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಬೇರೆಡಿಕೆಯುನ್ನು ಇತ್ತಾಗಿ ಗ್ರಿ ಕೂಡ ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಳಿನ ಸಹಿ ಶರತಕ್ಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇವತ್ತಿನದಿವರ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಪಾದಕ ಮಾತ್ರಾ ತೆಪ್ಪಿ ವಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಘೋಷಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಇದುಂದ ಸುಮಾರು ಹತ್ತು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಾಗಳ ಹೊರೆಯನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಜನರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೊನ್ನುವಾದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯುತ್ತಿ ಯಾಡುತ್ತದೆ, ಅವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರಾಧಿಕಾರ ಮಾನಿದೆ ಈ ವಸಾದ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು. ಇಂಥಾಗಿ ಮುಸೂಡಿ ಸಾರಾಧಿಕಾರ ಮಾನಿದೆ ಹೋಗಿರೆ ಇದೆ ರಿಖ್ವಾ ಎಂಬ ವಸಾದ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು ನ್ನು ವೆಚ್ಚಂತೆ ನೆನ್ನಿಂದಿದೆ. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಜನ ಅಥವಾ ಒಟ್ಟು ಜನ ಈ ಬೇರೆಡಿಕೆಗೆ ಅನುಮೋದಿತ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗುವಿದ್ದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾರಾಧಿಕಾರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಅದರ

ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಬಂದರೆ ಆಗೆ ಅದೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವರ ಯೋಗ್ಯತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಮೀಕರಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ನಂದಿಗ್ಗೆ ತರಿಸಿತ್ತಿರುವುದು, ಬಡ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ, ಕೂಲಕಾರಂಗೆ, ಕಪ್ಪ ಪದುತ್ತಿರುವ ರ್ಯಾತ್ರಿಗೆ ಅವರ ಜೀವನವನ್ನೇ ಸಾಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ದುರ್ಭರಿತಾಗಿರುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷ ಹತ್ತು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಹೊರೆಯನ್ನು ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇರಿ ತನ್ನೂಲಕ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರಬಹಿ ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 40-50 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಬೀಳುಕ್ಕು ಸದಿರಂ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕುದು ನಾಧು ವಾದುದಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಮನುಷಿಯನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕು. ಈ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಈ ಮನುಷಿಯನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯಾಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪೂರ್ತಿತ್ವಾತ್ಮಕ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಈ ಮನುಷಿಯನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟಿರ್ಬಳಿಯೂ ಬಿನ್ನ ವಿನಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

MOTION TO ADJOURN CONSIDERATION

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I beg to move :

“That the consideration of Mysore Ministers Salaries and Allowances (Amendment) Bill, 1967 be adjourned.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the consideration of Mysore Ministers Salaries and Allowances (Amendment) Bill, 1967 be adjourned.”

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು ಇದನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಣ್ಣೆ ಖಾಸಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಾಳಿಗಳಿವೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂದ್ರ ರೈನ್‌ನ್ಯೂ ಅಬಾಲಪ್ನೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇದೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನೀರು ಸರಬರಾಬು ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇದೆ, ನಮಗೆ ಕೆಂಪ್ನಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಸೇರಿ ಕಣಾರಾಂಚಕ ಎಂದು ಅಗಬೀರು ಏನ್ನು ವಿಷಯ ಇವೆಲ್ಲ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿವೆ. ಅದೇ ಇಂಥ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಬಿಡ್ಡ ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಾವು ಒಂದು ನಿಷ್ಠಾದಾದ, ಅತಿ ನಿಷ್ಠಾದಾದ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಇವೆಲ್ಲತ್ತು ಚಚೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಬೆಳಿಗೆ ಎಂಟಿ ಗಂಟೆಯಿಂದ ಇವರೆಗೂ ಕುಳಿತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯಗಳು, ಇವತ್ತು ಜನತಿಗೆ ಅನೇಕಾಲವಾಗಿತ್ತು ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಎಣ್ಣೆ ಇಲ್ಲವಾಗ ಈ ಬಿಲನ್ನು ಅತುರಿಂದ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೇಗೆ ಪುಡು ಅನವಂಜನವಾದುದು ಮತ್ತು ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾದುದು.

ಎರಡೆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕಾನ್ವೆಸ್ಟಿಷನ್‌ಫೆಸಲ್ ಹಾಲಿಂಟ್‌ಸ್ನೇಹಾರಲ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ, ನಾಕಪ್ಪ ಅವೆಂಡ್‌ಪುಂಡ್ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತ ಕುಳಿತರೆ ಇವತ್ತು ಈ ಬಿರು ಮುಗಿಯುತ್ತದೆ ಅನ್ನನುವಿದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದ್ದಿಂದ ಇದರ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಯನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವ ತಾರಿಖಿಗಾದರೂ ಹಾಕಿ ಆಗ ಇನ್ನು ಉದಿರಿತಕ್ಕ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೊಲಾವಾರೆಯವರು ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರು ನಾಗಾಷ್ಟಿನಾಗಿರದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಜಾಲಿಂಟ್ ರೈನ್‌ನ್ಯೂಫ್ನೇ ಕಳಿಸಿದಾರೆ, ಅದು ಅತಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು ಅದನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಾಗೇಂದು ಕೇವಲ 20-22 ಜನರಿಗೆ ಲಾಭವಾಗುವ ಬಿಲನ್ನು ತಂದು ಅದನ್ನೇ ಮೌದಲು ಚಚೆ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ, ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಜನರಿಗೆ ದೋಷ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಅತಿದೋಷ ನೀರಾವರಿ ಯೋಜನೆಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ತವಾಂಗಿಲಾರಾದು. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒತ್ತಾಯಿಸಿದಾರು, ಇದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ, ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸಂಬಂಧಿತ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಕೈಯಿಸಿಪ್ಪಿ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳೇನಿವೆ ಅ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಿಂಬಿಯಾದಬೇಕು, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಾವಾಗಿಯೇ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಮಾಂದೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಬೆಳಿಗಿನಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲವಿವರಿಗೆ ಏರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಯವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಜನರ ಹಿತದ್ವಿಷಯ ಕಡೆ